

REMARKS

This current Reply is responsive to a current and non-final Office Action dated (mailed) 06/21/2005. This current Office Action examined claims 1-20.

Generally, the current Office Action rejected claims 1-20.

Specifically, the current Office Action indicated the following:

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Williams et al., USPN 5,845,283 (hereafter referred to as Williams).

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of O'Brien et al., USPN 6,795,809 B2 (hereafter referred to as O'Brien).

No claims are canceled or added by this Reply. Hence, claims 1-20 continue to be presented for examination. Of claims 1-20, claims 1, 6, 9, 13, 19, and 20 are independent.

All of the rejections are based at least partly on Williams et al. (U.S. Patent 5,845,283).

1 **Unreturned PTO-1449**

2 It appears that one previously-submitted PTO-1449 as part of an  
3 Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) has not been returned.

4 It was submitted on/around 03/11/2005, and it listed one (1) U.S. Patent  
5 [Rich et al., No. 5,593,724].

6 It is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider the document  
7 submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.97 and 1.98, initial and sign the  
8 corresponding PTO-1449 to indicate such consideration, and return a copy of the  
9 initialed and signed PTO-1449 to Applicants.

1 Remarks Regarding Williams et al.

2  
3 [1] Williams et al. appears to be generally directed to "Method and  
4 apparatus for rationalizing different data formats in a data management system".  
5 (The Title)

6 More specifically, Williams et al. appears to be directed to:

7 A data conversion device, including a preferably software implemented  
8 data conversion engine, which receives a formatted input data stream from an  
9 input device, converts the data into a different (universal) format in real time and  
10 transmits the converted data to an output device. Messages, i.e., data, from host  
11 devices can also be uplinked, via the data conversion device, to the data  
12 generating devices. By rapidly processing new and/or incompatible data record  
13 formats the invention minimizes the cost of maintaining data management  
14 systems and maximizes their usage. The conversion device input and output  
15 architecture is flexible and the conversion device can be used with multiple  
16 (networked or non-networked) data generating devices and single or multiple data  
17 storage devices using multiple data output formats.

18 (The Abstract)

19 [2] The data conversion device of Williams et al. is an integrated,  
20 monolithic device.

21 More specifically, the description of Williams et al. reads:

22 As best seen in FIG. 3A the data conversion device 22 uses a unique  
23 message interface (MI) to process each supported record format. When the data  
24 conversion device 22 receives a record, *the appropriate MI uses a conversion*  
25 *engine 23 embedded in the data conversion device 22 to translate the record*  
*data from the input format to a desired Universal Data Format (UDF), which*  
may be an industry specific format. As described in more detail below with  
reference to FIG. 3B, the conversion engine 23, according to the invention,  
preferably includes a super-record storage 23a for holding data streams during

1 the conversion processes and, for storage of the data conversion rules applicable  
2 to the various message interface devices, a library storage 23b. More  
3 specifically, it is the library 23b which contains the conversion rules applicable  
4 to the field of UDF(s).

5 (Column 5, Lines 1-15; *italicized emphasis added*)

6 Consequently, there is no loading or plugging-in of any conversion  
7 technology (e.g., a module) with Williams et al.

8 [3] Although there are multiple different logical message interfaces  
9 (MIs) in Williams et al., there is only a single conversion module.

10 More specifically, FIGS. 3A and 3B include a single "conversion routine  
11 library 23a". For example, the description of Williams et al. reads:

12 The library 23a contains the conversion routines. Examples of  
13 conversion routines found in the library 23a are an ASCII-to-EBCDIC routine, or  
14 a date conversion routine.

15 [...]

16 2) The conversion routine library 23a is then called on to convert a date  
17 field and a time field. The routines in the library 23a will convert the date field  
18 and time field to the UDF format.

19 [...]

20 5) The conversion routine library 23a is called on to make the date field  
21 and time field conversion.

22 (Column 6, Lines 44-46; Column 6, Lines 59-62; and Column 7, Lines 3-4)

23 Consequently, Williams et al. does not describe multiple conversion/parsing  
24 modules.

1 Remarks Regarding O'Brien et al.

2  
3 The current Office Action reads on page 5 at paragraph #17, in pertinent  
4 part:

5 Williams does not specifically teach the log is a test log. However,  
6 O'Brien taught a test log (column 13, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to  
7 one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that  
8 incorporating O'Brien's test log in Williams system for rationalizing different  
9 data formats would have improved system utility.

10 Even assuming, *arguendo*, (i) that O'Brien teaches the concept of test logs  
11 and (ii) that Williams et al. and O'Brien et al. may be combined as indicated in the  
12 current Office Action, such an assertion and combination does not remedy the  
13 above-described deficiencies of Williams et al.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 Remarks Regarding the Independent Claims

2  
3 In contrast to Williams et al., alone or combination with O'Brien, each of  
4 the independent claims includes element(s) directed to multiple conversion/parsing  
5 modules and/or element(s) directed to loading or plugging-in module(s).  
6

7 Hence, no art of record, either alone or in any combination, anticipates or  
8 renders obvious at least the following element(s) in conjunction with the other  
9 elements of their respective claims:

10 Claim 1: providing a uniform interface for multiple plug-in modules,  
11 wherein each plug-in module is adapted to parsing at least one of the multiple  
12 formats.

13 Claim 6: a parsing module adapted to parsing at least one data record  
14 format . . . wherein the parsing module is capable of being plugged-in by a  
15 parsing engine when a data record of the at least one data record format is to  
16 be parsed.

17 Claim 9: loading a parsing module adapted to parsing at least one data  
18 record format.

19 Claim 13: loading a log parser plug-in module to interpret the test log,  
20 wherein the plug-in module is adapted to parsing at least one test log format.

21 Claim 19: a plurality of log parser plug-in modules . . . a log parser  
22 engine for loading the correct log parser plug-in module for a given log  
23 format.

24 Claim 20: a means for loading the correct log parser plug-in module for  
25 a given log format.

1 Remarks Regarding the Dependent Claims

2  
3       Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 13 have been  
4 provided above. Claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-12, and 14-18 depend directly or indirectly  
5 from these independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 13, respectively. Although each also  
6 includes additional element(s) militating toward allowability, these dependent claims  
7 are allowable at least for the reasons given above in connection with their respective  
8 independent claims.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1-20 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the Office pass the instant Patent Application to issue with all due haste.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9/21/2005

By: Keith W. Saunders  
Keith W. Saunders  
Reg. No. 41,462  
(509) 324-9256 x238